	11	
1	Patric A. Lester (SBN 220092) pl@lesterlaw.com Lester & Associates 5604 Mission Center Read, #258	
2		
3	5694 Mission Center Road, #358 San Diego, CA 92108 Bhoney (610) 383, 6078	
4	Phone: (619) 283-6078 Fax: (314) 241-5777	
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	JACQUELINE TAYLOR,	Case No. <u>'15CV0618 CAB RBB</u>
11	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT
12	VS.	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
13	TRANSWORLD SYSTEMS, INC. a California corporation and DOES 1-5,	
14	inclusive,,	
15	Defendant	
16)
17	JURISDICTION AND VENUE	
18	1. This Court has federal question subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.	
19	§ 1331, as the action arises under the federal statute titled the Telephone Consumer	
20	Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, ("TCPA"). The Court has personal jurisdiction over the	
21	Defendant and venue is proper under 28 § 1391(b)(1) and (d) as in this District.	
22	INTRODUCTION	
23	2. This is an action brought by an	individual consumer, Jacqueline Taylor,
24	(hereinafter "Plaintiff") against Transworld Systems, Inc. (hereinafter "Transworld" or	
25	"Defendant") for violations of the TCPA by making unconsented autodialed calls to	

Plaintiff makes these allegations on information and belief, with the

Plaintiff's cell phone. All undesignated section references to 47 U.S.C. §277 are to the

26

27

28

TCPA.

3.

4

5 6

> 7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

28

exception of those allegations that pertain to Plaintiff, or to Plaintiff's counsel, which Plaintiff allege on personal knowledge.

4. Plaintiff seeks statutory damages and injunctive relief under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).

THE PARTIES

- Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Los Angeles, California. 5.
- Defendant is a California corporation that does business in this district at 6. 8885 Rio San Diego Dr., San Diego, CA 92108, and may be served through its registered agent, CT Corporation Systems, 818 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, CA 90017.
- At all times relevant, Defendant was engaged in the business of debt 7. collection, using the mails and telephone to collect consumer debts.
- 8. Plaintiff is currently ignorant of the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of the Defendants sued herein under the fictitious names Does 1 through 5, inclusive and therefore, sues such Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of said fictitiously named Defendants when their true names and capacities have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon, alleges that each of the fictitiously named Doe Defendants are legally responsible in some manner for the events and occurrences alleged herein, and for the damages suffered by Plaintiff.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that all 9. defendants, including the fictitious Doe Defendants, were at all relevant times acting as actual agents, conspirators, ostensible agents, partners and/or joint venturers and employees of all other defendants, and that all acts alleged herein occurred within in the course and scope of said agency, employment, partnership, and joint venture, conspiracy or enterprise, and with the express and/or implied permission, knowledge, consent, authorization and ratification of their co-Defendants; however, each of these allegations

are deemed "alternative" theories whenever not doing so would result in a contradiction with the other allegations.

- 10. All Defendants, including Does 1 through 5, are collectively referred to as "Defendants" or "Transworld."
- 11. Whenever this complaint refers to any act of Defendants, the allegations shall be deemed to mean the act of those defendants named in the particular cause of action, and each of them acting individually, jointly and severally, unless otherwise alleged.
 - 12. Plaintiff is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153.
- 13. Defendant at all times mentioned herein was a person as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153.

THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

14. Congress enacted the Telephone Consumer Protection Act in 1991. The TCPA prohibits certain uses of telecommunication equipment that would interfere with telephone services subscribers' privacy and/or property rights with respect to their telephone. In particular, the TCPA provides that:

It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States, or any person outside the United States if the recipient is within the United States to make any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using any automatic telephone dialing system ... to any telephone number assigned to a ... cellular telephone service ...

47 U.S.C. § 27(b)(1)(A).

Predictive dialers initiate phone calls while telemarketers are talking to other consumers ... In attempting to "predict" the average time it takes for a consumer to answer the phone and when a telemarketer will be free to take the next call, predictive dialers may either "hang-up" on consumers or keep the consumer on hold until connecting the call to a sales representative,

resulting in what has been referred to as "dead air."

In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 2003 Report and Order, CG Docket No. 01-278, FCC 03-153, ¶146, 18 FCC Rcd. 14014, 14101, 2003 WL 21517853, *51 (July 3, 2003), available at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-153A1.pdf ("2003 Report and Order").

15. The TCPA provides telephone service subscribers a private right of action for injunctive relief and statutory damages for violations:

A person or entity may ... bring ... an action based on a violation of [47 U.S.C. § 227(b)] to enjoin such a violation, an action to recover for actual monetary loss from such a violation, or to receive \$500 in damages for each such violation, whichever is greater, or both ... If the court fines that the defendant willfully or knowingly violated [47 U.S.C. § 227(b),] the court may, in its discretion, increase the amount of the award to an amount equal to not more than 3 times the [statutory damages available above].

47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 16. Beginning on or about October 23, 2014 and on multiple occasions since that time, up to and including November 26, 2014, Defendant and/or its agents directed a campaign of telephone collection calls to Plaintiff's cell number (XXX) XXX-9585 (hereinafter "cell phone"). These calls exceeded twenty (20) in number.
 - 17. These telephone calls by Defendant violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b) (1)(A)(iii).
- 18. Defendant placed these calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone via an 'automatic telephone dialing system', as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1).
- 19. Plaintiff did not provide 'express consent' allowing Defendant to place telephone calls to Plaintiff's cellular phone utilizing an 'automatic telephone dialing system', within the meaning of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
 - 20. Under the TCPA and pursuant to the FCC's January 2008 Declaratory

Ruling, the burden is on the Defendant to demonstrate that Plaintiff provided express consent within the meaning of the statute, because it is the best entity to determine how numbers were attained.

- 21. The cell phone called by Transworld was purchased by Plaintiff. Plaintiff is the exclusive user of this cell phone. Plaintiff's cellular telephone plan for this phone is a prepaid plan that Plaintiff pays in advance for a set number of minutes, which number is reduced during phone calls received or made.
 - 22. Plaintiff asserts a claim under the TCPA.
- 23. All telephone contact by Defendant to the cell phone of Plaintiff used equipment that was placed by an "automatic telephone dialing system," within the meaning of 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A).
- 24. Defendant used a predictive dialer to make these telephone calls to Plaintiff's telephone number, without her prior express consent.
 - 25. This practice violates the TCPA.
- 26. Plaintiff answered some of these calls. When she did answer dead air came on the line, which is a telltale sign that Transworld used a predictive dialer.
- 27. Plaintiff attempted to stop the calls numerous times by saying into the dead air (in case it was being recorded) to "stop calling me, I'm not the person you are trying to reach" but was unable to speak to a live operator or to prevent the calls from continuing.
- 28. The complained of telephone calls constituted calls not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. §227(b) (1) (A) (i).
- 29. Based on information and belief, Transworld placed each and every call alleged in this complaint with one or more predictive dialers.
- 30. Transworld's parent company Expert Global Solutions, Inc. form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2011's states that: "We provide the following BPO [Business Process Outsourcing] Services:"

Accounts Receivable Management

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

10

9

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

Transworld Systems. Our subsidiary, Transworld Systems Inc., provides first-andthird-party early stage and past due aaccount recovery services fro small, medium and large businesses through a demand letter series, reminder calls, or a customized program to fit individual business needs...

Technology and Infrastructure

We have implemented a scalable technical infrastructure that can flexibly support growing client volume while delivering a high level of reliability and service. Our customer contact centers feature advanced technologies, including predictive dialers, automated call distribution systems...

Our ARM call centers utilize both virtual and onsite predictive dialers to address our low-balance, high-volume accounts, and our CRM centers utilize predictive dialers to conduct our clients' outbound calling campaigns. These systems scan our databases, simultaneously initiate calls on dedicated predictive dialers, and determine if a live connection is made.

Our [Accounts Receivable Management] all centers utilize both virtual and onsite predictive dialers to address our low-balance, high-volume accounts, and our CRM centers utilize predictive dialers to conduct our clients' outbound calling campaigns. These systems scan our databases, simultaneously initiate calls on dedicated predictive dialers, and determine if a live connection is made. (P.5-6) (This was the last 10-K filed by either entity. Certification And Notice Of Termination Of Registration for Transworld as an addition registrant was filed in April of 2012.)

Predictive dialers constitute an automatic dialing system; they are capable 31. of storing, producing, and dialing any telephone number, and are capable of storing, producing, and dialing telephone numbers using a random or sequential number generator. Further, no human manually entered Plaintiff's cellular telephone number

when Transworld made the calls alleged below. Rather, the predictive dialer(s) electronically dialed Plaintiff's cellular telephone in an automated fashion. The predictive dialers otherwise constitute an "automatic telephone dialing system" under the meaning of 47 U.S.C. §227(a)(1).

- 32. Defendant's misconduct in placing these telephone calls to Plaintiff's cell phone was negligent and Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b) (3) (B).
- 33. Defendants' misconduct in placing some or all of these telephone calls to Plaintiff's cell phone was willful and knowing and Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b) (3) (C).

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act)

- 34. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 35. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.
- 36. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b) (3) (B).
- 37. Plaintiff is also entitled to and seeks injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act)

- 38. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs before his Third Count for Relief as though fully stated herein.
 - 39. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and

1	multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to		
2	each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.		
3	40. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C.		
4	227 et seq., Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages for each		
5	and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C)		
6	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
7	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against each Defendant,		
8	and for Plaintiff, and prays for the following relief:		
9	(1) Award of statutory damages of \$500.00 for each and every negligent		
10	violation of the TCPA, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b) (3) (B);		
11	(2) Award of statutory damages of \$1,500.00 for each and every		
12	knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, pursuant to 47 U.S.C.		
13	§ 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C);		
14	(3) Such other and further relief this court may deem just and proper.		
15	TRIAL BY JURY		
16	41. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States		
17	of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.		
18			
19	Dated March 18, 2015 Lester & Associates By s/ Patric A. Lester		
20	By <u>s/ Patric A. Lester</u> Attorney for Plaintiff, E-mail: pl@lesterlaw.com		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	Q Q		
	8 COMPLAINT		